

REMARKS

Claims 31-41 of the subject application are currently pending, and have been rejected by the Examiner. In the accompanying amendment, the Applicants have amended claims 31-41. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the written description, claims, and drawings as originally filed. On account of the foregoing listed support for the amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter.

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "interoperability period (IOP)" as recited in claims 31-41. By virtue of the accompanying amendments, the term "interoperability period (IOP)" has been deleted from the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should withdraw his objection to the specification.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to show the first, second, and third units recited in claim 39. In response, Applicants have amended claim 39 to recite the features of a processor and a computer readable medium, which features are illustrated in new Figure 5. It is respectfully submitted that new Figure 5 does not add new matter since the components illustrated in Figure 5 are fully supported by the written description, as originally filed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has objected to claims 31-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner found claims 31, 35, and 39 to be unclear on whether the claimed "HomeRF CP" was the same as the HomeRF CP unit and whether the claimed "second HomeRF unit" was the same as the second HomeRF unit. In response, the Applicants have amended claims 31, 35, and 39 and respectfully submit that by virtue of the amendments to the claims, the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

With regard to claim 39, the Examiner objected to the claim on the ground that the first unit lacked a structural cooperative relationship with the second and third units. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 39 to remove the first, second, and third units.

In view of the amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdrawal his rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 31-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nevo, et al. (US 6600726) in view of Haartsen (US 6,519,460).

Applicants have transversed claim 31 includes the following limitations:

A method comprising:

 a HomeRF connection point (CP) unit establishing a connection with a HomeRF unit;

 the HomeRF CP unit establishing a connection with a Bluetooth unit as a slave to the HomeRF CP unit as a master;

the HomeRF CP unit determining a a contention free period, during which the HomeRF CP unit and the HomeRF do not transfer data;

the HomeRF CP unit communicating the contention free period to the Bluetooth unit, the Bluetooth unit to wake from a suspended state at the time of the contention free period;

transmitting data between the HomeRF CP unit and the HomeRF unit;

during the contention free period, the HomeRF CP unit ceasing transmission of data to the HomeRF unit and transitioning from a first hopping frequency to a higher second frequency hopping and transmitting data between the HomeRF CP unit and the Bluetooth unit;

at an end of the contention free period, the HomeRF CP unit transmitting a next contention free period to the Bluetooth unit, ceasing transmission of data to the Bluetooth unit and transitioning from the second hopping frequency to the first frequency hopping and transmitting data between the HomeRF CP unit and the HomeRF unit until the next contention free period.

(emphasis added)

Nevo describes a wireless device 100 which includes a transceiver 102a and a transceiver 102b. The transceiver 102a is able to communicate with devices 104a using a wireless network protocol A, whereas the transceiver 102b is able to communicate with devices 104b using a wireless network protocol B. Nevo describes a technique to control when the transceivers 102a, and 102b are operative. But as will be seen from Figure 2 of the drawings, devices 104a, and devices 104b are operative in all time periods. Thus, there is no contention free period during which devices 104a and the wireless device 100 are not transferring data, or in which devices 104b and the wireless device 100 are not transferring data.

Based on the foregoing, it will be seen that Nevo fails to teach or suggest the above emphasized limitation of claim 31. Further, the combination of Nevo and Haartsen fails to teach the above emphasized limitation of claim 31. Accordingly, it is

respectfully submitted that claim 31 is not obvious in view of the combination of Nevo and Haartsen.

Given that claims 32-34 depend on claim 31, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not obvious in view of the combination of Nevo and Haartsen.

The remaining claims include limitations similar in scope to the above discussed limitations of claim 31, and accordingly it is respectfully submitted that these remaining claims are also not obvious in view of the combination of Nevo and Haartsen. It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, all rejections have been overcome. All pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.


If the Examiner determines that prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Vani Moodley at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: November 27, 2004



Tom Van Zandt
Reg. No. 43,219

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please add new Figure 5.